## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5 and 7-14 are pending in this application. Applicants amend Claims 1, 13 and 14. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at paragraphs [0044]-[0048] of the specification. Claims 13 and 14 are amended for clarity. Support for the amendments to claims 13 and 14 can be found, *inter alia*, in the original claims as filed. No new matter is added.

## Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action asserts that claims 13 and 14 are unclear in that resin product design parameters are not control parameters, but are related to product design, and "would not be capable of controlling the molded device."

Applicants respectfully traverse and amend claims 13 and 14.

Applicants amend claim 13 to recite a method for producing a resin product, comprising molding a resin product in an injection molding process so as to produce a resin product that satisfies resin product design parameters obtained from the method according to Claim 1.

Claim 14 is amended to recite a memory section which memorizes molding parameters determined by a computer-aided optimization method such that a resin product that satisfies resin product design parameters obtained from the method according to Claim 1 can be produced.

Claims 13 and 14 are thus not indefinite.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/812,064

Attorney Docket No.: Q80748

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rebello et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0149498) in view of Wilson (U.S.

Patent No. 6,558,605), taken together with either Yu et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,096,088), or Friedl

et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,820) in view of Norton (U.S. Patent No. 6,454,973).

This rejection is essentially a duplicate of the Office's previous rejection set forth in the

Office Action mailed June 12, 2007. The specific reason provided by the Office for maintaining

the rejection is that the claimed limitation of keeping one valve gate open at any time during the

filling stage would allegedly have been obvious in the process of injection molding since no

filling could occur with all the valve gates closed.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and amend claim 1.

Claim 1 is amended to recite "wherein resin product design parameters are optimized

under the condition where at least one of the valve gates is selected as a timing regulation gate

that is restricted by the action of other gates, so that at least one valve gate is kept open at any

given time during filling stage."

Applicants have thus clarified that "at least one of the valve gates is selected as a timing

regulation gate that is restricted by the action of other gates," the purpose of which being that "at

least one valve gate is kept open at any given time during filling stage." In order to implement

the feature "at least one valve gate is kept open at any given time during filling stage," at least

one of the valve gates is selected as a timing regulation gate that is restricted by the action of

other gates.

7

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/812,064

Attorney Docket No.: Q80748

The combination of "at least one of the valve gates is selected as a timing regulation gate

that is restricted by the action of other gates" and "at least one valve gate is kept open at any

given time during filling stage" is nowhere disclosed in, nor suggested by, any combination of

references cited by the Office. Hence, the features of claim 1, from which all remaining claims

depend, would not have been obvious over the references cited at the time of the invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 61,444

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373 CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 8, 2008

Michael Raucci

8